

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 077597  
ORIGIN SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00  
INRE-00 /026 R

DRAFTED BY PM/ISP: AVERSHBOW/ENEWSOM:MAF  
APPROVED BY PM:LGELB  
NSC - R. BARTHOLOMEW  
ACDA - S. KEENY  
JCS - GEN. SMITH  
DOD/ISA - W. SLOCOMBE  
EUR - J. GOODBY  
P. PLAN  
L/PM - M. MATHESON  
S/S: SVALERG

-----126928 250200Z /63

O 250118Z MAR 78  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO AMEMBASSY PARIS IMMEDIATE  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
USMISSION USNATO  
INFO USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE

S E C R E T STATE 077597

EXDIS GENEVA FOR U.S. SALT II

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, SALT, NATO, FR

SUBJECT: NEXT STEPS ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION

REF: A) PARIS 9607; B) STATE 61784; C) LONDON 4451;  
D) STATE 69375; E) USNATO 2948; F) BONN 5289

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 077597

1. FOR PARIS: THE FOLLOWING POINTS ARE REPLIES KEYED TO  
THE QUESTIONS POSED BY PAGNIEZ AND MISTRAL ABOUT THE US  
INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION (PARA 3, REF A):

A. FALLBACK LANGUAGE WOULD BE PRECISELY THAT PREVIOUSLY  
PROVIDED IN NAC, AS CORRECTLY CONFIRMED BY EMBASSY.

B. WE ARE NOT RPT NOT CLEAR ABOUT THE MEANING OF THE FRENCH QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER THE INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT WOULD BECOME THE "OFFICIAL US POSITION". THE NON-PAPER PROVIDED THE GOF (PARA 5, REF B) CONTAINS THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE US POSITION ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION, AND IS THEREFORE AS "OFFICIAL" NOW AS WHEN IT WILL BE MADE IN A MORE POLISHED FORM TO THE NAC AND TO CONGRESS AFTER SIGNATURE OF A SALT AGREEMENT. EMBASSY SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT THE ACTUAL INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT TO BE MADE TO THE NAC AND TO CONGRESS MIGHT DIFFER IN LANGUAGE OR FORM, DEPENDING

-

ON FURTHER US REFLECTION AND CONSULTATIONS WITH THE ALLIES, BUT NOT IN THE SUBSTANTIVE POINTS CONTAINED IN THE NON-PAPER.

C. EMBASSY SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT A NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION WOULD APPLY EQUALLY TO THE TREATY AND THE PROTOCOL, AND THAT, THEREFORE, THE POINTS IN THE US NON-PAPER ON OUR INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT WOULD APPLY TO THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY AND PROTOCOL. WITH REGARD TO THE SPECIFIC FRENCH QUESTION ABOUT "NUMERICALLY LIMITED SYSTEMS," EMBASSY CORRECTLY POINTED OUT THAT THE PROTOCOL DOES NOT  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 077597

CONTAIN ANY NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS, SO THAT PARTICULAR POINT WOULD NOT BE RELEVANT TO THE PROTOCOL.

D. EMBASSY SHOULD CLARIFY THAT PROTOCOL DOES, RPT DOES, PROHIBIT TESTING AND/OR DEPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS: FLIGHT-TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OF CRUISE MISSILES WITH RANGES OVER 2500 KM; DEPLOYMENT OF CRUISE MISSILES WITH RANGES OVER 600 KM ON GROUND- AND SEA-BASED LAUNCHERS; DEPLOYMENT OF MOBILE ICBM LAUNCHERS; AND, UNDER US PROPOSAL, FLIGHT-TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OF ICBM COMPONENTS NOT FLIGHT-TESTED PRIOR TO DATE OF SIGNATURE OF THE AGREEMENT. SINCE NON-CIRCUMVENTION APPLIES TO PROTOCOL FOR DURATION OF PROTOCOL AND TO TREATY FOR DURATION OF TREATY, TRANSFERS IN THE PROTOCOL PERIOD OF THESE SYSTEMS, AND TECHNOLOGIES UNIQUELY RELATED TO THEM, WOULD BE PROHIBITED FOR THE PURPOSES PROHIBITED BY THE PROTOCOL. TRANSFERS OF THESE SYSTEMS AND RELATED TECHNOLOGIES FOR PURPOSES NOT PROHIBITED BY THE PROTOCOL WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED, ALTHOUGH SUCH TRANSFERS WOULD INVOLVE POLICY CONSIDERATIONS AND WOULD HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH IN LIGHT OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SITUATION ON A CASE-BY-CASE

BASIS, AS WOULD BE THE CASE IF THERE WERE NO AGREEMENT. IF GOF REQUESTS FURTHER CLARIFICATION, E.G. HOW THIS INTERPRETATION APPLIES TO SPECIFIC SYSTEMS, YOU SHOULD NOT COMMENT, BUT SEEK GUIDANCE FROM WASHINGTON.

E. EMBASSY'S RESPONSE TO THE UK/SLBM QUESTION WAS CORRECT. THE US POSITION IS THAT TRANSFERS OF NUMERICALLY LIMITED SYSTEMS ARE NOT NECESSARTLY PRECLUDED; THEY WOULD, HOWEVER, BE DEALT WITH ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, WITH FULL CONSIDERATION OF THE POLICY ISSUES INVOLVED, AND IN LIGHT OF EXISTING PATTERNS OF CO-OPERATION IN THE ALLIANCE.

2. PLEASE REPORT GOF RESPONSE TO THESE CLARIFICATIONS,  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 077597

AND SEEK TO DETERMINE IF GOF MAY CHANGE ITS POSITION ON OPPOSITION TO NON-CIRCUMVENTION. (FYI: IN VIEW OF WELL-KNOWN FRENCH ALOOFNESS FROM SALT AND RELATED ISSUES, US HAS NOT RPT NOT CONSIDERED GOF ACQUIESCENCE IN OUR NON-CIRCUMVENTION STRATEGY, INCLUDING USE OF THE FALLBACK LANGUAGE, A SINE QUA NON. HOWEVER, FRENCH ACQUIESCENCE OR SUPPORT WOULD OF COURSE BE IMPORTANT IN DEMONSTRATING FULL ALLIANCE UNITY ON THIS ISSUE. END FYI.)

3. FOR LONDON, PARIS AND BONN: POSTS SHOULD EXPRESS OUR APPRECIATION FOR THE RECENT HELPFUL BILATERALS, AND MAKE CLEAR THAT WE BELIEVE WE HAVE SATISFIED ALLIED QUESTIONS ON THE NON-CIRCUMVENTION FALLBACK THROUGH OUR INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT. WE PLAN SIMPLY TO REPORT, IN A REGULARLY-SCHEDULED NAC EARLY IN APRIL, OUR INTENTION TO PROCEED WITH OUR STRATEGY FOR CLOSING OFF THE ISSUE. WE DO NOT RPT NOT ANTICIPATE ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION IN THE NAC OF THIS ELEMENT OF OUR NON-CIRCUMVENTION APPROACH. AS NOTED IN REF B, WE DO NOT RPT NOT WISH TO DISCUSS ACTUAL TEXT OF DRAFT INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT AT THE APRIL NAC, ALTHOUGH WE WOULD ANTICIPATE A FUTURE NAC CONSULTATION WHICH WOULD LOOK AT THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE. YOU SHOULD ALSO REITERATE THAT WE HAVE THUS FAR GIVEN DRAFT INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT ONLY TO FRG,UK AND FRANCE, AND THAT ITS EXISTENCE AND SUBSTANCE SHOULD BE HELD IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

4. FOR LONDON: REGARDING UK CONCERNS OVER TIMING OF FALLBACK (REF C), YOU SHOULD INDICATE WE APPRECIATE HMG'S PREFERENCE FOR WAITING UNTIL THE "END GAME", BUT STILL BELIEVE WE SHOULD RETAIN THE FLEXIBILITY TO TABLE THE FALLBACK WHEN WASHINGTON IS CONFIDENT IT WILL RESOLVE THE ISSUE ON TERMS FAVORABLE TO THE ALLIANCE.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 077597

5. FOR BRUSSELS: YOU SHOULD PROCEED WITH BILATERAL  
PER INSTRUCTIONS REF D, PARA 4 AND 5.

6. FOR USNATO: PLEASE INFORM LUNS THAT US WILL DELIVER  
A REPORT ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION AT A REGULAR NAC EARLY IN  
APRIL, AS A "STATEMENT ON POLITICAL SUBJECTS", PER  
RECOMMENDATION REF E. YOU SHOULD INFORM LUNS THAT AFTER  
AMBASSADOR BENNETT MAKES HIS REPORT OF THE US INTENTION  
TO PROCEED WITH OUR NON-CIRCUMVENTION STRATEGY, WE WOULD  
LIKE LUNS TO MOVE ON TO NEXT ITEM. WE HAVE CONCLUDED  
THE CONSULTATIONS ON THIS ISSUE AND ARE SIMPLY INFORMING  
THE NAC OF OUR INTENTION TO ACT. THEREFORE, WE SEE NO  
NEED FOR A DISCUSSION. TEXT FOR DELIVERY BY AMBASSADOR  
BENNETT WILL BE PROVIDED SEPTEL.

7. FOR ALL POSTS: DUE TO THE SENSITIVITY AND COMPLEXITY  
OF THIS ISSUE, YOU SHOULD REFER ALL QUESTIONS OR REQUESTS  
FOR CLARIFICATION TO WASHINGTON FOR FURTHER GUIDANCE. VANCE

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** AMENDMENTS, NEGOTIATIONS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL)  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 25 mar 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978STATE077597  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** AVERSHBOW/ENEWSOM:MAF  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780131-0541  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:**  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780324/aaaaauma.tel  
**Line Count:** 194  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 98a6adbd-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** 78 PARIS 9607, 78 STATE 61784, 78 LONDON 4451  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 18 may 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3202246  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** NEXT STEPS ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION  
**TAGS:** PARM, FR, NATO  
**To:** PARIS LONDON MULTIPLE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/98a6adbd-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014